



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	-CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,898	07/05/2001	Harm M. Deckers	034547-0104	3117

22428 7590 01/14/2003

FOLEY AND LARDNER
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

PAK, YONG D

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1652

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/897,898	DECKERS ET AL.
	Examiner Yong Pak	Art Unit 1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on October 15, 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 14-18 and 25-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 14-18 and 29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed October 15, 2002, canceling claims 1-13 and 19-24 and adding claims 25-29, has been entered.

Claims 14-18 and 25-29 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group III, with an election of species (b), a product capable of chemically reducing a target, in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged.

Claims 25-28 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 8.

Priority

Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

The second application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the first application (the parent or provisional application); the disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the second application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ 2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The parent application, 09/577,147, does not disclose a method of preparing an emulsion formulation comprising a thioredoxin or thioredoxin reductase, which is claimed in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 14-18 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maloney et al. in view of Deckers et al.

Maloney et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. Us 2002/0088025 – form PTO 892) teach a method of producing a oil body protein such as oleosin or caleosin from plant comprising thioredoxin or thioredoxin reductase by introducing into a safflower cell a chimeric nucleic acid sequence comprising a DNA sequence capable of regulating transcription, a second DNA sequence encoding a fusion polypeptide comprising a DNA sequence encoding a sufficient portion of an oleosin gene and a DNA sequence encoding a thioredoxin or thioredoxin reductase, and a third DNA sequence capable of terminating transcription (Claims 1-21 and Columns 5-7). The formulation of Maroney et al. can be used to chemically reduce a target because the formulation contains a thioredoxin reductase.

The difference between the reference of Maroney et al. and the instant invention is that the reference of Maroney et al. does not teach a method of emulsifying the formulation comprising the thioredoxin or thioredoxin reductase and the oil body protein.

Deckers et al. (WO 98/53698 - form PTO 1449) teach a method of preparing emulsion formulation comprising oil bodies by obtaining oil bodies from a cell, washing the oil bodies and formulating the washed oil bodies into an emulsion (page 3). Deckers et al. teach that emulsion formulations are advantages in that they are more stable and maybe be readily applied in a variety of domestic and industrial applications, such as for the preparation for food products, personal care products and pharmaceutical products (pages 1 and 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to add the emulsifying step of Deckers et al. to

the method taught by Maroney et al. The motivation of emulsifying the formulation of Maroney et al. is to increase its stability and/or apply the formulation in a variety of domestic and industrial applications. One of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success since the method taught by Deckers et al. can be used to isolate oil bodies from cells and the art of emulsifying formulations are routinely performed in the art.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yong Pak whose telephone number is 703-308-9363. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M weekdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy can be reached on 703-308-3804. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9307 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Yong Pak
Patent Examiner

January 9, 2003



PONNATHAPUACHUTAMURTHY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600